

Comment on the Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement

I agree with the following statements which I have checked:



FEB 08 2000

- 1 ☒ The No Action Alternatives are not reasonable. The EIS should have a reasonable no action alternative.
- 2 ☒ The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.
- 3 ☒ The analysis of transportation impacts in Nevada is insufficient for making modal, corridor and route decisions.
- 4 ☒ The floodplain analysis is insufficient for corridor and route selection.
- 5 ☒ The impact of stigma on tourism, recreation and agriculture based economies in Nevada should be analyzed.
- 6 ☒ The EIS should analyze the impacts of a crash between a military airplane and a nuclear waste rail car.
- ☐ Other _____

Comments:

The Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement includes an option to construct a rail line from Beowawe to Yucca Mountain through Crescent Valley to transport nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain. DOE is required to consider all comments submitted regarding the impacts of building and operating a repository including transportation.

My comments for the record are:

7 Nuclear waste needs to be stopped at the
source. Alternative energy needs to become a
priority 1. The EIS, which I have read
8 some of and attended the meeting on Dec. 9th,
proves to very inadequate. EIS statements are a
big undertaking I understand, but a lot more
work needs to be done on this one.

Nancy Plummer